DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 289 854 SP 029 754

AUTHOR Jerich, Kenneth F.
TITLE A Survey of Pre-service Teachers Enrolled in a General Methods Course with Perceptions of Micro-teaching Laboratory toward Various Components of the Experience.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Regional Spring Mini-Clinic of the Association of Teacher Educators (Oak Brook, IL, April 25-26, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Instructional Effectiveness; *Methods Courses; *Microteaching; Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Attitudes; *Supervisory Methods; Teacher Education Curriculum

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the reactions of 39 teacher candidates toward the following components of a general methods course, "Micro-Teaching: Practice in Teaching Techniques": (1) instruction in methods; (2) pre-teaching conferences; (3) laboratory teaching; and (4) post-teaching conferences. The subjects, who were enrolled in two sections of the course, had chosen their fields of specialization in English, mathematics, science, and social studies. An analysis of the responses to the 54-item questionnaire and supervisor rating form supported the following conclusions: (1) the overwhelming majority of the subjects found the four components of the course effective and mutally supportive, although differences were found between students enrolled in the two sections of the course; (2) clarity of goals and relationships between class content and laboratory practice was found to be a problem for some topics in one or another of the two sections; and (3) the data can be interpreted as suggesting that clinical supervision was implemented and generally found to be effective in obtaining laboratory goals of reflective self-analysis. A copy of the questionnaire is appended along with comments from the subjects. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED289854

A Survey of Pre-service Teachers Enrolled in a General Methods Course with Perceptions of Micro-teaching Laboratory Toward Various Components of the Experience

DR. KENNETH F. JERICH
Teaching Techniques Laboratory
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Paper to be presented at the Regional Spring Mini-Clinic of the Association of Teacher Educators in Oak Brook, Illinois
April 25-26, 1986

THEME: THE KNOWLEDGE BASE FOR AND RESEARCH IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

SP 029 754

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. Jerich

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Abstract

Pre-service teacher candidates perceptions of relevance and adequacy of instruction of the four components of a general methods course with a coordinated micro-teaching laboratory experience were assessed through the use of a forty-nine item questionnaire and supervisor rating form. The components of interest were: (a) instruction in methods, (b) pre-teaching conferences, (c) laboratory teaching, and, (d) post-teaching conferences. Thirty-nine pre-service teacher candidates enrolled in two sections of a general methods course participated in the study. Their fields of specialization included English, mathematics, science, and social studies. Item and factor analyses of the Likert ratings of course components found support for the following conclusions:

1. The overwhelming majority of pre-service teacher candidates found the four components of the course effective and mutually supportive although differences were found between pre-service teacher candidates enrolled in the two sections of the course.

2. Clarity of goals and relationships between class content and laboratory practice was found to be a problem for some topics in one or another of the two sections.

3. The data can be interpreted as suggesting that clinical supervision, as defined by Goldhammer and others, was implemented and generally found to be effective in obtaining laboratory goals of reflective self-analysis.

A Survey of Pre-service Teachers Enrolled in a General Methods Course with Perceptions of Micro-teaching Laboratory Toward Various Components of the Experience

Introduction

In 1967, the Illinois model of micro-teaching was established at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign thus the creation of the Teaching Techniques Laboratory. The curriculum was designed by an advisory committee of professors from the Department of Secondary Education. The advisory group rejected the notion of using the technical skills approach to micro-teaching developed at Stanford University and elected to develop a general methods curriculum.

As the Illinois model evolved to the present general methods program, Micro-teaching: Practice in Teaching Techniques, evaluations were conducted. For example, Beetner and Johnson (1968) conducted an assessment of the teachers' reactions to micro-teaching practice. Chang (1970) elaborated Beetner and Johnson. In 1979, in response to an Illinois State Board of Education mandate regarding implementing clinical experiences in teacher education programs, the general methods course, Micro-teaching: Practice in Teaching Techniques, was added to the teacher education curriculum. Prior to 1979, aspects of the general methods course have been used in other special methods courses which were service by the Teaching Techniques Laboratory. The present Illinois program has been in operation for five and one-half years.

To date, the general methods course classroom sessions are designed to prepare pre-service teacher candidates (here after known as teacher candidates) for using two basic categories of teaching skills. One deals with interaction patterns, or methods, the other with strategies for planning and developing logically derived content of lessons during instruction. It is the responsibility of pre-service teacher candidates to identify styles of teaching that are comfortable for them and that satisfy the basic expectations and educational needs of the pupils whom they teach in the Laboratory.

The general methods course class meets two times per week for sixteen weeks. Each class session is one hour in length. Class sessions are devoted to presenting topics directly related to the act of teaching and presenting orientations of the teaching strategies that the pre-service teacher candidate (here after known as teacher candidate) practices in the laboratory setting.

Before each lesson is taught in the laboratory, a pre-service teacher candidate meets with his/her supervisor to discuss the use of lesson planning and content strategies. Close attention, within a cooperative clinical supervision framework, is given to the particulars of the lesson plan, content and method strategies, and in assessing the extent to which the lesson will be effective.

Micro-teaching is defined as a scaled down teaching encounter (Allen and Ryan, 1969). In the practice

(micro-teaching) component of the general methods course, the dynamics of the teaching-learning act is scaled down by two means, the first being the instructional time period and the second being the size of the group instructed. In the Laboratory, each lesson is twenty minutes in length. The number of pupils taught per lesson ranges from five to seven. Furthermore, the practice component provides an opportunity for teacher candidates to combine method strategies with content strategies in order to integrate different behaviors to complement the teaching-learning act.

Research Problem

The purpose of this study was to assess the reactions of thirty-nine teacher candidates toward the components of the general methods course, Micro-teaching: Practice in Teaching Techniques. A questionnaire (Appendix A) and an instrument to rate the Teaching Techniques Laboratory supervisors (Appendix B) were prepared and administered to thirty-nine teacher candidates enrolled in two different sections of the general methods course during the Fall semester, 1985. Section A accounted for thirteen teacher candidates. Section B accounted for twenty-six teacher candidates. The questionnaire contained fifty-four structured items. The rating form contained sixteen structured items and four open-ended items.

The questionnaire was designed to explore four areas of concern (a) attitudes toward the classroom component of the course, (b) opinions of mediation of content in pre-conferences,

(c) attitudes toward the laboratory component of the course, and (d) the curricular concerns of the course. The supervisor rating form explored the area, the role of the micro-teaching supervisor in conjunction with the before mentioned areas.

Questionnaire and rating form responses were identified by the teacher candidate's social security number. As is the case with all aspects of the micro-teaching practice, the teacher candidates were reassured that their responses to the instruments would in no way influence their grades for the course in which they were enrolled. The instruments were administered one week prior to the final examination period of the course.

Research Methodology

A frequency-distribution program and a principal-axes factor analysis program, followed by a varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization, were used to carry out the statistical analysis of data on the Control Data Cooperation Cyber 175 using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). The results of the factor analysis must be considered understanding the size of the sample was inadequate for such an analysis.

General Reaction

Indicative of the teacher candidates' reactions to the components of the general methods course is the consistently positive reaction (ratings) on all items of the two instruments, that is, the questionnaire and the supervisor rating form. For example, item forty-six of the questionnaire asks the teacher candidate to what extent were your post conferences with the

micro-teaching supervisor helpful in gaining a clear understanding of the strategies you taught. The mean response was 5.62 (on a seven point scale) with over sixty-nine percent of the teacher candidates scoring a 6 (41%) or 7 (28.2%) on the item. Item eleven of the rating form asks how effective was the supervisor in presenting material in post conference sessions. The mean response was 5.77 (on a seven point scale) with over seventy-one percent of the teacher candidates scoring a 6 (40%) or 7 (31%) on the item.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics on Cluster "Topics of the Course."

Item	Title	% in 4-7 range	M	SD
11	Topics to lab teaching (scale is: clearly related)	64	4.15	1.28
13	In-depth lesson planning (scale is: clearly presented)	44	3.56	1.81
17	Content strategies (scale is: clearly presented)	87	4.95	1.48
18	Method strategies (scale is: clearly presented)	90	5.34	1.14
19	Instructional objectives (scale is: clear understanding)	72	4.44	1.60
22	Logical development of content (scale is: clearly presented)	69	4.15	1.49
23	Teacher and pupil behaviors (scale is: clearly presented)	92	5.18	1.22
29	Teaching concepts (scale is: clearly presented)	87	5.15	1.48

30	Classroom questioning (scale is: clearly presented)	90	5.46	1.26
31	Sequencing in instruction (scale is: clearly presented)	69	4.39	1.64
54	Value analysis (scale is: clearly presented)	64	4.15	1.85

Note: Each percentage figure is a cumulative percentage based on scoring the item in the four to seven range. 1 = lowest score; 7 = highest score.

The teacher candidates were asked a series of items regarding the extent to which course topics were clearly presented in the class sessions of the course. Of the eleven items that addressed this concern (see Table 1) approximately sixty-five percent of the teacher candidates indicated that the topics, collectively, were clearly presented during the course.

Additionally, the teacher candidates were asked to rate the extent to which they found the topics presented in the class related to what they were to teach in the laboratory. Over eighty-nine percent indicated that they found the topics presented in the class were related to what they were to teach in the laboratory (item 11).

Moreover, the teacher candidates were asked to rate the supervisory style used in the laboratory and to rate the supervisor. Approximately ninety-three percent of the teacher candidates rated the supervisory style as being effective with thirty-one percent rating it "very" effective. Approximately

ninety percent of the teacher candidates rated their supervisor as being effective and forty-one percent rating them "very" effective. The means were 5.7 and 6.13, respectively (items 1 and 2 of the supervisor rating form).

A last indication of general teacher candidate reaction to the laboratory is taken from testimonials. These are collected and included as received in Appendix C. We leave their interpretation to the interested reader.

Of particular interest to the evaluators is how the items could be analyzed to help identify psychological constructs from our research concerns. We decided to use the analytic method, factor analysis, to determine the number and nature of the underlying variables among the items thus extracting common factor variances from sets of measures into constructs.

To accommodate the discrepancy between the sample size of our research and the sample size necessary to meet the rigors of the research method, factor analysis, we proceeded to analyze the highest correlation coefficients among the forty-nine items (variables). We analyzed the correlation coefficient matrix which contained over 1200 possible correlations. Establishing a level of .40 and above as our standard for purposes of analysis, we checked each item, which had forty-eight correlations, horizontally and vertically as well as cross-checking the neighboring correlation possibilities. By identifying the correlation coefficients below the .40 level across the entire matrix, we believe that this constituted a kind of a factor

analysis in itself. We were able to eliminate twenty-four items (variables) on that basis. Hence, we will able to conduct a factor analysis on twenty-five items (variables) to meet the established requirements of the research methodology.

Table 2

Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix after Rotation with Kaiser Normalization.

Variable	--Eight Factors--							
Item	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
7	**.61**	.37	-.22	.12	.12	-.08	.03	.05
9	**.89**	.04	-.08	.03	-.06	.19	-.02	.20
10	.22	.11	-.07	**.43**	.27	.28	-.05	.01
11	**.72**	.13	.19	-.23	.31	.12	.10	.22
12	**.57**	.04	.18	.04	.28	.11	-.15	-.01
13	**.75**	.06	-.07	-.30	.06	-.04	.30	-.07
14	.19	-.02	.11	-.04	**.96**	-.01	.08	.02
15	-.05	-.12	-.14	-.03	.20	.08	.43	-.11
17	.17	-.05	-.02	.15	.03	.07	-.01	-.11
18	**.50**	.30	.03	.15	.29	.10	.27	.11
21	.34	.00	.26	.11	**.48**	-.13	.10	.06
27	-.08	.31	**.77**	.16	.14	.19	-.05	-.03
28	-.08	.15	**.84**	-.00	.10	-.07	-.04	-.02
29	**.62**	-.13	-.16	.34	.16	.07	-.05	-.27
30	**.68**	-.10	.13	.01	.08	.20	.06	.00
31	**.75**	-.14	-.07	.01	.04	.09	-.07	-.07

32	-.11	-.01	.16	**.74**	.16	-.04	.21	.13
37	.05	.14	.14	.01	.02	-.16	**.79**	.15
38	.03	-.08	-.3-	.03	-.03	.26	**.57**	-.02
41	-.05	**.91**	.21	.16	.15	.04	-.05	.06
43	.16	-.29	.13	-.10	-.10	.10	.29	.38
44	.12	.02	-.02	.02	-.08	**.67**	.01	-.21
46	.13	**.77**	.22	-.03	-.14	-.09	.03	.05
47	-.18	.01	.09	.03	-.05	.10	.12	.07
48	.01	.28	.14	**.55**	-.08	.07	-.27	.09
49	.04	.02	-.02	**.64**	-.10	.06	-.16	.04
50	.17	-.13	.10	.21	-.00	**.81**	.09	.27
51	-.35	-.05	.03	.10	-.20	**-.40**	.32	.25
52	.08	.20	-.08	.30	.17	-.09	-.05	**.80**
53	-.27	.05	-.29	.01	-.26	-.04	.13	.34

Note: Loadings of .40 and higher are bold faced.

We discovered that eight factors, Factors A-H (see Table 2) accounted for ninety-two percent of the total variance. Of the eight factors, we decided to disregard factor seven--accounting for 5.8% of the total variance--because we view it as being bound by situational constraints beyond our control, for example, time frame and financial support, and as such being irrelevant to our discussion.

From these data, it appears more than fair to conclude that the components of the general methods course were generally well

received by the teacher candidates in the undergraduate teacher education program. An exceptional number of teacher candidates placed the highest value on laboratory practice while the overwhelming majority of them rated the multifaceted aspects of the course clearly presented and effective.

Analysis of Specific Research Concerns

Attitude Toward Classroom Component. Many teacher candidates find that they have a clear understanding of the goals and objectives of the general methods course. Yet, in terms of clarity, teacher candidates are concerned that the goals and objectives of the course be clearly related to the topics presented in class. Differences across instructors of the different sections of the general methods course about the extent to which the goals and objectives were stressed may very well account for the way teacher candidates responded to those items.

Specifically, teacher candidates felt that certain topics, in comparison with others, needed to be more clearly presented during the classroom sessions of the course. Conversely, teacher candidates reported that some topics, for example, "classroom questioning", "method strategies in teaching" (items 30,18), were more clearly presented than others with the reported means scores of 5.46,5.34, respectively.

One might suspect that it is quite important that the objectives of the course be related to the topics presented in the class sessions of the course. Evidently, teacher candidates believed that too. Over ninety-two percent of the teacher

candidates indicated that the topics presented in class were related to the course objectives. On a seven point scale, the composite mean score of the two sections of the course was **4.67** with one section reporting a mean of 5.44 and the other section reporting a mean of 4.13.

Table 3

Summary of Factor A: Clarity of Topics Presented By The Course Instructor In Relation To The Course Objectives.

Item	Loading
9. The objectives of the course were related to the topics.	.89
31. The topic "sequencing in instruction" was presented in class.	.75
13. The topic "in-depth lesson planning" was presented in class.	.75
11. Topics presented in class were related to laboratory teaching.	.72
30. The topic "classroom questioning" was presented in class.	.68
29. The topic "teaching concepts" was presented in class.	.62
7. Pre-service teachers have an understanding of the course objectives.	.61
12. The topic "conceptual overview" was presented in class.	.57
18. The topic "method strategies in teaching" was presented in class.	.50

Note: The higher the score, the greater the loading.

As shown is Table 3, Factor A, accounting for 29.6% of the total variance reflects the extent to which teacher candidates perceived that topics were presented clearly by the course instruction. Clarity, then, was a significant aspect of the general methods course that was evaluated by the instruments used in this study.

A significant group of teacher candidates believed that the orientations to the laboratory procedures were quite helpful in preparing them for their micro-teaching experience. Approximately ninety-seven percent of the teacher candidates rated the orientations helpful with forty-one percent rating it "very helpful" (item 14). Also, the viewing of a model tape on the micro-lessons was found to be quite helpful.

Table 4

Summary of Factor E: Orientations To The Laboratory Procedures.

Item	Loading
14. Orientations to the laboratory procedure were helpful in preparing for micro-teaching experiences.	.96
21. Supervisor orientations of the Laboratory procedures presented in class were helpful.	.48
Summary of Factor G: Curricular Decisions About The Program.	
37. Number of micro-lessons to be taught.	.79
38. Time limit of the laboratory micro-lesson.	.57
15. Viewing of a model tape micro-lesson was useful.	.43

As indicated in Table 4, factor loadings for the orientations to the laboratory procedure and viewing of a model tape on the micro-lessons were perceived by the teacher candidates as being significant functions in the operation of the classroom component of the course. Overall, topics were clearly defined by the instructors, instructional materials were helpful, and instructor and TTL supervisor orientations of the Laboratory procedures presented were helpful, all of which indicated that the processes involved in delivering the content of the general methods course were perceived by the teacher candidates as being useful and in many instances were quite helpful to the teacher candidates.

Our interpretation at this time is to observe that the content presented in the general methods course is, to a large extent, comprehensive in nature, is integrated within a developmental framework of learning, and is clearly related to the principles of theory and practice in teaching. For many of the teacher candidates, the content was clearly presented enough to use in the development of the teaching style of their choice and in the acquisition of facts, knowledge, and understandings of the act of teaching.

However, for others, the content presented interfered with their acquisition of facts, knowledge, and understandings of the act of teaching. It is to this concern that further research must be conducted. In what ways can the classroom component of the general methods course be enhanced to foster consistently

clear and helpful processes for learning must be investigated further.

Mediation of Content Presented During the Pre-conferences. Teacher candidates meet their Laboratory supervisors before they teach each micro-lesson. During each pre-conference, the supervisor is instructed to maintain a reflective stance to create an unrestrictive environment to enable a pre-service teacher candidate to freely introduce and explain his/her lesson plan of the micro-lesson he/she plans to teach. A teacher candidate is strongly encouraged to analyze his/her own lesson during a pre-conference, as the supervisor serves a "coaching role" when needed.

Table 5

Summary of Factor B: Helpfulness of Supervisory Style in Conferences.

Item	Loading
41. Supervisors are helpful in improving pre-service teachers' micro-lessons.	.91
46. Post conferences are helpful for pre-service teachers in gaining an understanding of strategies they used in the micro-lesson.	.77
Summary of Factor C: Supervisory Style in Pre Conferences.	
28. Supervisors offer an alternative explanation of content presented by the course instructor.	.84
27. Supervisors introduce additional information about the topics covered in class.	.77

For purposes of our discussion (see Table 5) we have combined Factors B and C which collectively accounted for 26.2% of the total variance. These factors closely align themselves with this specific area of our research. Item forty-six indicates that teacher candidates perceived a tendency on the supervisors' part to carry over the idea of mediation during the post conference sessions.

Approximately fifty-two percent of the teacher candidates indicated that the supervisor usually asked them what was covered in the class sessions of the course (item 26) with approximately sixty-nine percent of the teacher candidates indicating that the supervisor usually introduced additional information about the topics covered in the class sessions of the course (item 27). Of particular interest to us is that approximately sixty-four percent of the teacher candidates indicated that their supervisors offered an alternative explanation of the content presented by the course instructor (item 28). Sixty-four percent of the teacher candidates indicated that both their supervisor and they analyzed their lesson plans together during the pre-conference (item 43).

We are concerned with the extent to which Laboratory supervisors create an atmosphere that might alter the ethos of an unrestrictive environment for teacher candidates to present their lesson plans. In this regard, four points surfaced. First, do supervisors manipulate teacher candidates' thoughts and actions during the pre-conference? Second, if this type of supervisor

manipulation occurs, to what extent does it create an atmosphere whereas teacher candidates are planning their lessons to please the supervisor? Third, to what extent does this type of supervisor manipulation send a "hidden" agenda to teacher candidates that by pleasing their supervisor they are pleasing their general methods course instructor? Finally, does the type of supervisor manipulation distract teacher candidates to the point that their lessons no longer become a developmental growth experience?

We found that approximately eighty-seven percent of the teacher candidates indicated that they found their supervisor helpful in improving their micro-lessons and that thirty-six percent of the teacher candidates rated their supervisor as being essential for improving their micro-lessons (item 41). We believe that the rapport between our teacher candidates and supervisors is excellent--as indicated by over ninety-five percent of the teacher candidates surveyed--and does contribute to a healthy environment for our teacher candidates to freely express themselves during their pre and post conferences. From these data, we speculate that the Laboratory supervisors do not overly mediate the content presented by the teacher candidates during their pre-conferences, but nevertheless, suggest that there is a need for further investigation in this area.

Attitude Toward Laboratory Component. Teacher candidates were asked a series of questions related to the aspects of the Laboratory (practice) component of the general methods course.

Approximately ninety-seven percent of the teacher candidates viewed the instructional materials of the Laboratory procedure helpful (item 44) and over eighty-nine percent of the teacher candidates believed that their post conferences with their Laboratory supervisor were helpful in gaining a clear understanding of the strategies they taught (item 46). Teacher candidates believed that the pupil evaluator remarks--that is, the pupils they taught--were quite helpful in assessing their strengths and weaknesses as a teacher with twenty-three percent of the teacher candidates indicating that the pupil evaluator remarks were always helpful (item 53).

Teacher candidates also believed that its important for the supervisor to maintain a reflective stance to provide them with an opportunity to discuss their teaching style without prescribing solutions. Approximately forty-nine percent of the teacher candidates indicated that the Laboratory supervisor always maintained a reflective stance (item 50). They believed that their supervisors were giving them plenty of opportunity (72%) to review the pupil evaluator remarks (item 49) and ample opportunity (75%) to self-analyze their video-taped micro-lesson (item 52).

Moreover, teacher candidates believed that the supervisors were doing an excellent job of supervising them and that they enjoyed the supervisory style employed in the Laboratory component of the general methods course.

Laboratory supervisors receive training in clinical supervision based on an established index of clinical supervision as formulated by Goldhammer (1969). As such, the role of the supervisor is supportive in nature throughout the entire process of pre-conference, micro-lesson, and post-conference.

Overall, teacher candidates believed that (a) there was adequate time to review and synthesize their lessons during the post conferences, (b) supervisors were quite knowledgeable in the field of teacher training, (c) supervisors were very conscientious about their responsibilities, (d) supervisors effectively presented material in pre and post conferences, and more importantly, (e) supervisors cared about them as individuals and their teaching with sixty-seven percent of the teacher candidates indicating that their supervisor always cared about them and their teaching.

Table 6

Summary of Four Factors: Reactions to the Essential Elements of the Curricular Design of the Teaching Techniques Laboratory.

Factor D:	
Item	Loading
32. Laboratory provides appropriate setting to practice various content and methods strategies.	.74
49. Supervisor gives plenty of opportunity to review completed pupil evaluator forms in post conferences.	.64

Factor E:

14. Orientations to the laboratory procedure were helpful in preparing for micro-teaching experiences.	.96
21. Supervisors' orientations of the laboratory procedures presented in class sessions were helpful.	.48

Factor F:

50. Supervisors maintain reflective stance to provide opportunity for pre-service teachers to discuss their teaching style without prescribing solutions.	.81
44. Instructional materials of the laboratory were helpful.	.67
51. Content of the different course sections should be consistent with each other.	.40

Factor G:

37. Laboratory should increase number of micro-lessons.	.79
38. Laboratory should increase the time of the micro-lesson.	.57
15. Viewing of a model tape was useful.	.43

Again, for purposes of our discussion (see Table 6) we have combined Factors D,E,F,H, which collectively accounted for 30.5% of the total variance. When viewing the collective similarities between the item loadings of the factors there appears to emerge one major construct from the four individual factors which we have identified as being the curricular design of the Teaching Techniques Laboratory.

Curricular Concerns of the Course. Teacher candidates expressed strong feelings about the curricular concerns of the components of the general methods course. First, they were pleased with the amount of lessons to be taught during the course with fifty-nine percent of them indicating that no change in the amount of lessons to be taught is needed (item 37). Teacher candidates indicated a preference of slightly increasing the amount of pupil centered lessons to be taught and a slight decrease of teacher centered lessons to be taught. Second, approximately forty-nine percent of the teacher candidates indicated that the twenty minute lesson should not be changed with over twenty-five percent of them indicating a preference for a slight increase of the time allotment. Third, the overwhelming majority (97%) of teacher candidates indicated that their last micro-lesson was influenced by their previous micro-lessons (item 47) and that the Laboratory is an appropriate setting to practice content and methods strategies in teaching and to develop and refine their strategies in teaching. Ninety-five percent of the teacher candidates believed that the college hours credit for the course should be greatly increased. Finally, on four different factor categories, item 51--content of the different course sections should be consistent with each other--appeared as a factor loading which we believe is an indication that this area needs further investigation.

Summary

Two groups of teacher candidates were surveyed regarding their reactions to certain aspects of the general methods course. The first group were teacher candidates enrolled in Section A (n=13). The second group were teacher candidates enrolled in Section B (n=26). The tabulated data lend support to the following conclusions.

1. The overwhelming majority of teacher candidates who completed the general methods course find the components of the course effective. Generally, teacher candidate reaction found in the questionnaire and supervisor rating form data was also found in testimonial data.

2. Course goals and objectives were understood by the teacher candidates. A variety of topics were presented in both sections of the course. The topics were defined by the instructors. In terms of clarity, many teacher candidates believed that the topics on a general basis were clear but there needs to be a concerted effort between instructors to make the topic presentations clear and consistent with each other in order to properly understand what is to be planned for and practiced in the Laboratory component of the course. There appears to be a need for further study in this area.

3. An attempt was made to capture the essence of the Laboratory component of the course. From questionnaire and rating form data we conclude that the desired supervisory style used in the Laboratory is effective and that our supervisors are

doing an effective job. Also, from this data we suspect that there is a need for further study of the interaction style between supervisors and teacher candidates during pre and post conferences.

4. A source of much concern to the investigators is the problem of curricular design of the course. Analysis of the data strongly suggests viewing the eight factors parsimoniously.

Three major themes emerged from the eight factors. Theme one deals with course objectives, the processes involved in the selection and presentation of topics, and the extent to which clarity of the content presented by the course instructor is related to the objectives of the course. Theme two looks at the types of interactions which occur between the Laboratory supervisors and teacher candidates when dealing with the processes involved in the mediation of content--that is presented in the class sessions of the course--which is used by teacher candidates as they teach their micro-lessons. Theme three is concerned with the impact of the essential elements of the curricular design of the Teaching Techniques Laboratory from an evaluative point of view of the teacher candidate and in conjunction with our impressions of the general methods course.

References

Allen, D. & Ryan, K. (1969). Microteaching. Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Beetner, E. & Johnson, William D. (1968). A survey of student teacher reactions to microteaching practice. Unpublished manuscript. University of Illinois, Teaching Techniques Laboratory, Champaign.

Chang, M. (1970). A study of student teachers reactions to microteaching (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1970).

Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers. New York: Rinehart & Winston.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PRE-SERVICE TEACHER JUDGMENTS QUESTIONNAIRE

PRESERVICE TEACHER JUDGMENTS OF SE ED 239 QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your social security number? _____ / / _____

FOR EACH QUESTION, CIRCLE ONLY ONE NUMBER THAT BEST REFLECTS YOUR JUDGMENT.

2. What is your sex?
   1. male
   2. female

3. What is your student classification?
   1. junior standing
   2. senior standing
   3. graduate standing

4. What is your field of concentration?
   1. english
   2. mathematics
   3. science
   4. social studies

5. Do you plan to make teaching a life time career?
   1. yes
   2. maybe
   3. no

6. To what extent did you understand the goals of the course?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 no understanding	clear understanding
7. To what extent did you understand the objectives of the course?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 no understanding	clear understanding
8. In terms of clarity, were the goals of the course related to the topics the instructor presented in class?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not clear	very clear
9. In terms of clarity, were the objectives of the course related to the topics the instructor presented in class?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not clear	very clear
10. To what extent did you understand the topics presented in class?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 no understanding	clear understanding
11. To what extent did you find the the topics presented in class related to what you were to teach in the laboratory?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not related	very related
12. The topic "conceptual overview" was clearly presented during the classroom sessions of the course?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not presented	clearly presented

13. The topic "in depth lesson planning was clearly presented during the classroom sessions of the course?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not presented	clearly presented
14. To what extent were your orientations to the laboratory procedure helpful in preparing for your microteaching experiences?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not helpful	very helpful
15. Did you find the viewing of a model tape on the microlessons useful?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not useful	very useful
16. To what extent did you find the instructional materials of the class sessions helpful?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not helpful	very helpful
17. The topic "content stratgies, for example, critical thinking, in teaching" was clearly presented in the class sessions of the course?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not presented	clearly presented
18. The topic "method strategies, for example, APIK, in teaching" was clearly presented in the class sessions of the course?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not presented	clearly presented
19. The topic "instructional objectives" was clearly presented in the class sessions of the course?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not presented	clearly presented
20. To what extent did you find the instructor's orientations of the Laboratory procedures presented in the class sessions helpful?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not helpful	very helpful
21. To what extent did you find the TTL supervisor's orientations of the Laboratory procedures presented in the class sessions helpful?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not helpful	very helpful
22. The topic "logical development of content" was clearly presented in the class sessions of the course?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not presented	clearly presented
23. The topic "teacher and pupil behaviors, for example, teacher and pupil interaction patterns, for the laboratory lesson" was clearly presented in the course?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not presented	clearly presented
24. To what extent did the instructor boost your enthusiasm about teaching?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not at all	extremely boost
25. To what extent did the instructor define the topics presented in class?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not defined	clearly defined

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

26. To what extent did the microteaching supervisor ask you what was covered in the class sessions of the course during the preconference?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 never asked	always asked
27. To what extent did the microteaching supervisor introduce additional information about the topics covered in the class sessions?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 never introduced	always introduced
28. To what extent did the microteaching supervisor offer an alternative explanation of the content presented by the course instructor?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 never offered	always offerd
29. The topic "teaching concepts" was clearly presented in the class sessions of the course?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not presented	clearly presented
30. The topic "classroom questioning" was clearly presented in the class sessions of the course?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not presented	clearly presented
31. The topic "sequencing of instruction" was clearly presented in the class sessions of the course?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not presented	clearly presented
32. To what extent did the laboratory provide an appropriate setting to practice various content and method strategies?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 never appropriate	always appropriate
33. To what extent did the laboratory provide an appropriate setting to develop and refine many teaching strategies?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 never appropriate	always appropriate
34. To what extent did the laboratory provide an appropriate setting to practice various types of questioning skills?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 never appropriate	always appropriate
35. The course instructor covered topics that were directly related to issues of teaching in today's schools?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 didn't cover	did cover
36. How would you describe the rapport between you and your microteaching supervisor?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very poor	excellent
37. To what extent should the laboratory increase and/or decrease the number of lessons to be taught during the semester?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 greatly decrease	no change greatly increase
38. To what extent should the laboratory increase and/or decrease the 20 minute microteaching lesson?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 greatly decrease	no change greatly increase

39. To what extent should the laboratory increase and/or decrease the amount of pupil centered lessons?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 greatly no greatly decrease change increase	
40. To what extent should the laboratory increase and/or decrease the amount of teacher centered lessons?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 greatly no greatly decrease change increase	
41. To what extent did you find your microteaching supervisor helpful in improving your microlessons?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not essential helpful	
42. To what extent does your microteaching supervisor have the knowledge necessary for overall supervisory work?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 doesn't does have have	
43. To what extent did the microteaching supervisor or you analyze your lesson during the preconference?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 he we I always both always did did did	
44. To what extent did you find the instructional materials of the Laboratory helpful?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not very helpful helpful	
45. Should the amount of college hours credit be increased and/or decreased for the course?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 greatly no greatly decrease change increase	
46. To what extent were your post conferences with the microteaching supervisor helpful in gaining a clear understanding of the of the strategies your taught?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 never always helpful helpful	
47. To what extent was your last microlesson influenced by your previous microlessons?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not completely influenced influenced	
48. To what extent did the laboratory provide an appropriate setting to practice various content and method strategies?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 never always appropriate appropriate	
49. To what extent did your microteaching supervisor give you an opportunity to review the completed pupil evaluator forms during the post conference?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 no plenty of opportunity opportunity	
50. To what extent did your microteaching supervisor maintain a reflective stance to provide you with an opportunity to discuss your teaching style without directly prescribing solutions?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 never always maintained maintained reflective reflective stance stance	

51.	The content covered in the different sections of the course should be more consistent with each other?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree — strongly agree
52.	During the post conference, to what extent did your supervisor give you an opportunity to self-analyze your video-taped lesson?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 no opportunity — plenty of opportunity
53.	To what extent were the pupil evaluator remarks helpful in assessing your strengths and weaknesses as a teacher?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 never helpful — always helpful
54.	The topic, "value analyses" was clearly presented in the class sessions of the course?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not presented — clearly presently

APPENDIX B

UIUC TEACHING TECHNIQUES LABORATORY SUPERVISOR EVALUATION FORM

Supervisor's Name: _____ _____
last first

Semester: _____ Year: _____

1. What is your social security number? ___/___/_____

FOR EACH QUESTION, CIRCLE ONLY ONE NUMBER THAT BEST REFLECTS YOUR JUDGMENT.

2.	Rate the supervisory style used in the laboratory.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not very effective
3.	Rate the supervisor.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not very effective
4.	The supervisor clearly indicated his/her role in the Teaching Techniques Laboratory.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 seldom always
5.	Indicate the extent to which the time allotment to review and synthesize your laboratory lessons should be changed.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 less no more time change time
6.	Did the supervisor improve your understandings of concepts and principles in teaching?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 seldom always
7.	Was the supervisor knowledgeable regarding content and method strategies of teaching?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 seldom always
8.	How would you characterize the supervisor's command of teacher training?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 poor excellent
9.	The supervisor was conscientious about his/her responsibilities?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not very very conscientious conscientious
10.	How well did the supervisor coordinate preconferences?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not very very well well
11.	How effective was the supervisor in presenting material in preconferences?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not very very effective effective
12.	How effective was the supervisor in presenting material in post lesson sessions?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not very very effective effective
13.	The supervisor encouraged development of new view points and appreciations.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 seldom always
14.	Evaluations of my work were made in a constructive manner.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 seldom always
15.	The supervisor promoted an atmosphere conducive to work and learning.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 seldom always

16. **The supervisor cared about me as a person and my development as a teacher trainee.** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 seldom always

IF YOU DESIRE TO DO SO, PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING SECTION OF THE FORM

What were the supervisor's strengths?	What were the supervisor's weaknesses?

What suggestions would you offer to improve the supervisor's effectiveness in preconferences and post analysis lesson sessions?

Additional comments:

APPENDIX C

PRE-SERVICE TEACHER CANDIDATES TESTIMONIALS

What were the supervisor's strengths?

"He really seemed to want to help me. When I was working with him he was concentrating on me and my lesson."

"She put a lot of work and thought into helping me prepare my lessons, that is, she questioned me thoroughly to see that I was clear on what I wanted to teach and she was very interested in helping me to evaluate the lessons."

"He knew my subject area, English. He made me probe, what was effective, what was not, how I could improve it, what I could add in a regular classroom to make a fifty minute lesson. He cares about teaching and learning."

"Knowledge, responsibility toward work."

"Very conscientious. Cared about her students. Understands concepts."

She is very patient and encourages teachers to discover their own strengths and weaknesses."

"His evaluations of my lessons were always constructive. He made me see how what I was learning would be useful in my future teaching experiences. He let me do a lot of self-evaluation. He took his job as a supervisor seriously."

"Constructively helped to point out my strengths and weaknesses--good "advice" on how to improve it."

"She explained what was expected of me as a teacher."

"Really made me think, honest position and encouraging, pleasant, cared about me as a person, realistic."

"He always created a reflective atmosphere so that I could say what had been good or bad about my lessons."

"My supervisor was very helpful with his comments. He never told me what to do. Instead, he questioned me about my tactics and asked what would be the result. Sometimes he suggested an alternative method. Very easy to work with. He gave constructive criticism."

"He was always able to build up my confidence when I was not sure."

"Enthusiastic, supportive, complete, objective (yea), and personal."

"Knowledge of many good examples from all fields to illustrate his points."

"Always ready to help with concepts not covered in class or ones that I hadn't quite grasped yet."

"He gave me plenty of suggestions during pre-conferences as well as his opinions of my topic. He is very knowledgeable of teaching techniques."

"She was very caring and interested in my growth as a teacher. She seemed to know a lot about the types of techniques."

"Always encouraged me to analyze on my own. Always gave suggestions when asked. Flexible, motivating."

"Questioning techniques. Good criticism."

"She gave me freedom. She knew the material she needed to know."

"Open and friendly. Good personality. Interesting to talk to. Great knowledge of teaching. Always makes remarks in a constructive fashion. Cares about student development."

"Tremendous insight into the demands of the classroom. Genuine regard for teaching of students."

"Very easy to talk to and he was always willing to help."

What were the supervisor's weaknesses?

"Communication-language was often a difficulty."

"Not focusing on tapes enough and asking reflective type questions."

"Language barrier. [Cold] disposition."

"He was hard to understand sometimes and seemed to ramble."

"Didn't watch the tape often enough."

"Didn't always give me feedback of his own during post-conferences."

"Her inability to <u>completely</u> communicate often hindered our working together. Didn't explain very much--just went along with what I did. Not too many helpful comments until end of lessons."

"Maybe allow a little more time to review tape. Also, maybe give hint of feedback as to his thought of performance."

KNOWLEDGE BASE FOR GENERAL METHODS

What suggestions would you offer to improve the supervisor effectiveness in pre-conferences and post-conferences lesson sessions?

"Maybe more specific post analysis."

"Allow the supervisor to participate in post conference. I can't always analyze my own strengths and weaknesses as well as someone looking or some constructive commentary would be helpful."

"It seemed like there was often confusion what different instructors wanted. Sometimes she [supervisor] would tell me something different than class or just wouldn't know."

"Give me feedback, watch tape more and ask specific questions. Don't spend so much time on pupil evaluator's evaluations. Ask specific questions rather them general."

"Give me criticism and talk clearer."

"Build in more time for post analysis."

"The supervisor could use a little more freedom in making suggestions to the students."

"I really wouldn't change anything. I felt relaxed and confident that my supervisor has my best interests in mind."

"Possibly to point out things on the tape. Give some of his own feedback in post conferences."

"Its not so much her fault but I was never clear about specifics of techniques because I never learned them in class. She could be more critical."

Additional Comments

"I feel that they [supervisors] should be more directly critical. There were things I needed to see about my lesson which I didn't pick up on. Also, even if someone doesn't like to look at the tape the supervisor should be able to comment on their [students] teaching technique. I felt no direct feedback was given. I didn't like to guess at what was wrong. I'd rather have it pointed out, especially in techniques which are very important to teaching."

"I enjoyed getting to know my supervisor. He helped me a lot and always seemed concerned how I was doing with things and ideas."

"I found that my supervisor and the TTL experience as a whole has helped me a great deal. I feel that a good supervisor makes a big difference on whether or not you liked microteaching. My supervisor and I seemed to have similar ideas about what a teacher should do. That makes it easy and fun to work with him." "After the post conference ideas of improvement for a lesson were helpful, but there isn't a second chance to get to try the ideas."

"I got a lot out of my work with him [supervisor]. He consistently challenged me to look at my teaching with fresh eyes and from a perspective I learned to respect. He addressed my weaknesses honestly and constructively."

"I feel the lab is much too structured according to teaching methods. I often felt, limited by the topic of the week, and was not able to teach my lesson in the most effective way. I needed to be able to synthesize many lessons that were too restricted by one discussion type, etc."

"I feel ripped off that I only got 2 hours credit for the amount of time put into this course. There should be an adjustment in credit hours."